UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/386,335	08/31/1999	NOBUHISA YODA	04329.2158	1305

22852 7590 03/09/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER	
PARK, CHAN S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/386,335	YODA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	CHAN S PARK	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 July 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/29/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 7/2/04, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1-19** are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, is attached to the instant Office action.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-6, filed 7/2/04, with respect to the rejections of claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, and 14-19 as being anticipated by Nakai et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,946,457 (hereinafter Nakai) under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Unno U.S. Patent No. 6,437,875.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1, 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With respect to claim 1, the claim recites that a single document image and information relating to the document image are inputted by the digital copier and the document is read periodically for the transmission. The claim seems to teach that the same single document is read periodically and thus transmitted to a destination device multiple times. However, referring to the original Specification (figs. 11 & 12), it teaches that a plurality of different documents is inputted by the copier and the documents are sent to different destinations based on the specified document information of each document. Examiner respectfully requests the applicant to point out where in the Specification, the same document is read periodically and transmitted multiple times to a single destination device. It is unclear as to whether the same document is transmitted to the same destination periodically.

With respect to claim 19, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

With respect to claim 7, the claim seems to teach that the data in the storage means is eventually erased. It is uncertain as to exactly when the data is erased. Is it erased after the data is read by the transmitting means? If so, how can the erased data be read periodically?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 5, 7 and 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unno in view of Nakai.

5. With respect to claim 1, Unno discloses a document input system (fig. 13 and col. 12, lines 33-45) comprising:

at least one digital copier (sending device) for inputting a document image and information relating to the document image, the information including information about a transmission destination (figs. 25-27 & 37);

at least one system serving as a transmission destination (clients in fig. 13) of the document image inputted by the at least one digital copier;

storage means (receiving device) for storing the document image inputted by the at least one digital copier and information relating to the document image; and

transmitting means for reading the information relating to the document image stored in the storage means and transmitting the document image corresponding to the read out information to one of the at least one system based on the read out information relating to the document image (fig. 12; col. 5, lines 30-35; col. 11, lines 1-64; & col. 14,

lines 10-39). Note that the examiner also interprets the servers in the network (fig. 1) as the transmitting means (col. 5, lines 30-35).

Unno, however, does not disclose expressly that the storage means reads the information relating to the document image stored in the storage means *periodically*.

Nakai, the same field of endeavor of the network data transmission, discloses a copier for transmitting a document image and information relating to the document image to a service center wherein the service center analyzes the transmitted/stored information *periodically* for the data management (col. 30, lines 46-55).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the system for analyzing the document information stored in a memory periodically of Nakai into the document input system of Unno.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to check the storage means periodically to see if any data has been received and required for further processing.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Unno with Nakai to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

6. With respect to claim 2, Unno discloses the document input system wherein,

the storage means includes sub-storage means (Notes DB, DB, Mail server, and DOX DB in fig. 13), provided so as to correspond to the at least one system respectively, for storing the document image and the information relating to the document image, and

the transmitting means includes sub-transmitting means (4450, 4500, 4550, and 4600 in fig. 13), provided so as to correspond to the at least one system respectively, for transmitting the document image to one of the at least one system based on the information relating to the document image read out.

7. With respect to claim 3, Unno discloses the document input system wherein, the digital copier comprises:

image input/output processing means for inputting the document image (scanner in sending device);

management means for inputting information relating to the document image inputted by the image input/output processing means (figs. 25-27); and

image input control means for determining a system which is a transmission destination of the document image inputted by the image means based on the information input/output processing relating to the document image inputted by the management means and storing the document image in the sub-storage means corresponding to the determined system (Note that the sending device sends the image data to appropriate servers based on the commands inputted by the user according to fig. 13 and col. 13, line 16 – col. 14, line 39).

8. With respect to claim 5, Unno discloses the document input system wherein, the image input control means generates title for the document image based on information relating to a document image inputted by the management means and stores the generated title in the storage means with the document image (figs. 38-40).

9. With respect to claim 7, Unno discloses the document input system, further comprising second storage means in which data storing time is longer than that of the storage means, and the transmitting means transfers the document image stored in the storage means and the information relating to the document image to the second storage means (col. 6, lines 5-6 & col. 18, lines 4-10 discloses the method of storing the image data in the HD).

10. With respect to claim 9, Unno discloses the document input system wherein until resetting to the information relating to the document image inputted by the management means is specified or a predetermined time passes after the document image is inputted by the image input/output processing means, the image input control means treats the document image inputted by the image input/output processing means as a series of information (col. 10, lines 33-49 & col. 16, lines 8-19).

11. With respect to claim 10, Unno discloses the document input system wherein the transmission destination is a document filing system, the transmitting means determines a title of a document image based on the information relating to the document image stored in the storage means and the determined title and the document image corresponding to the determined title are transmitted to the document filing system (fig. 40).

12. With respect to claim 11, Unno discloses the document input system wherein, the transmission destination is E-mail server and the transmitting means transmits a document image stored in the storage means to the E-mail server as an attached file of an E-mail (col. 14, lines 30-39).

13. With respect to claim 12, Unno discloses the document input system further comprising recognition means for recognizing a character string included in the document image stored in the storage means, wherein the transmission destination is an E-mail server and the transmitting means transmits the character string recognized by the recognition means to the E-mail server as data of a context of an E-mail (fig. 37 & col. 5, lines 30-35). Also, it is well known in the art that a character string "@" is recognized as an email address by the conventional network system.

14. With respect to claim 13, Unno discloses the document input system wherein, the transmission destination is a groupware server and the transmitting means transmits the document image stored in the storage means to the groupware server (col. 14, lines 21-39 and fig. 1).

15. With respect to claim 14, Unno discloses the document input system wherein, the transmission destination is a client computer having a program for document edition and the document image transmitted from the transmitting means is used by the program (col. 14, lines 21-39). It is well known to the one of ordinary skill in the art that the received Email image can well be saved and edited by the user at the PC using a program for document edition. Thus, it would have been obvious to include the document editing program at the receiving PC to modify/edit the received document.

16. With respect to claim 15, Unno discloses the document input system further comprising sub-storage means for storing the document image transmitted from the transmitting means, wherein the transmitting means, after the document image stored in the storage means is stored in the sub-storage means, transmits the document image to

the transmission destination (col. 6, lines 5-6 & col. 18, lines 4-10 discloses the method of storing the image data in the HD). Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to transmit the stored data in HD to the destination for further data transmission (email) or image processing (printing).

17. With respect to claim 16, Unno discloses the document input system further comprising sub-storage means for storing the document image transmitted from the transmitting means, wherein the transmitting means, if the document image information stored in the storage means can be transmitted to the transmission destination, transmits the document image information to the transmission destination and if not, stores the document image information in the sub-storage means (col. 22, lines 5-12). It is well know to one of ordinary skill in the art to save the untransmitted/unprocessed until it is completed. The motivation for doing so would have been to keep the data even if an error is occurred.

18. With respect to claim 17, Unno discloses the document input system wherein a storage area of the sub-storage means is divided for the at least one system (fig. 13).

19. With respect to claim 18, Unno discloses the document input system wherein a storage area of the sub-storage means is divided for the at least one system (fig. 13).

20. With respect to claim 19, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1, are applicable.

Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Unno and Nakai as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Okamura et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,266,162 (hereinafter Okamura).

21. With respect to claim 4, the combination of Unno and Nakai discloses the document input system according to claim 1, but it does not disclose expressly that the digital copier comprises job history means for storing history of various jobs including an input of the document image.

Okamura, the same field of endeavor of the network digital copier, disclose a digital copier comprises:

job history storage means for storing history of various jobs including an input of the document image;

job history management means for, if an error occurs in transmission of an inputted document image to a system of a transmission destination, storing information indicating an occurrence of the error in the job history storage means (fig. 48 & col. 19, lines 47-51).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have to modify the system to store the history of various job at the digital copier.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to notify the user of transmission results.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

22. With respect to claim 8, the combination of Unno and Nakai discloses the document input system according to claim 1, wherein if an error occurs before an input of the document image is terminated, an occurrence of the error is notified at the digital copier (fig. 16). The combination, however, does not disclose expressly whether an occurrence of an error after an input of the document is notified at the digital copier. Okamura, the same field of endeavor of the network digital copier, disclose a method of notifying of the error after an input of the document (col. 19, lines 47-51).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have to modify the system to store the transmission error report at the digital copier.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to notify the user of transmission results when there is an error.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Unno and Nakai as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Mori et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,292,267 (hereinafter Mori).

23. With respect to claim 6, the combination of Unno and Nakai discloses the document input system according to claim 5, but it does not disclose expressly that the image input control means assigns priorities to the information relating to the document image and generates title for the document image based on the priorities.

Mori, the same field of endeavor of the document processing, discloses a system for assigning priorities to the information relating to the document image and generates title for the document image based on the priorities (col. 44, lines 61-67).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have to modify the system to assign priorities to the document image.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to process the urgent document first.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the three references to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Conclusion

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHAN S PARK whose telephone number is (703) 305-2448. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Coles can be reached on (703) 305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chan S. Park
Examiner
Art Unit 2622

csp
February 28, 2005

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600